

From: [James McKenna](#)
To: [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Cc: [Jennifer Woronets](#); [Wyatt, Robert](#)
Subject: RE: Congressman Blumenauer Mtg April 22nd
Date: 03/31/2011 02:57 PM
Attachments: [Draft Agenda for April 22.docx](#)

Chip and Kristine:

Per Chip's email below I took a stab at generating a draft agenda for the RI/FS portion of the Blumenauer meeting (see attached).

Bob and I suggest we only provide the first three levels of bullets to Blumenauer's staff (i.e., down to the "i" level). Bob and I are providing the fourth level bullets (highlighted in yellow) as "talking points" to discuss with you and Kristine as we prepare for the presentation. We do not anticipate providing this level of detail in the agenda to Blumenauer's staff.

Should I have Jen arrange a conference call for the four of us to walk through the draft agenda and further develop our talking points?

Thanks,

Jim McKenna
Verdant Solutions, LLC
1519 SW Columbia Street
Suite A
Portland, OR 97201
Office: (503) 477-5593
Cell: (503) 309-1621
jim.mckenna@verdantllc.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 3:38 PM
To: Wyatt, Robert; James McKenna
Cc: Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Re: Congressman Blumenauer Mtg April 22nd

Bob & Jim

Here is what EPA is thinking to add a bit more structure to the meeting on the 22nd. Dan Opalski has talked with Hillary Barbour and she sounded receptive to a joint EPA/LWG presentation at the project management level for the in-water work. Also, Dick Pedersen is supportive of DEQ having the opportunity to provide the status update on source control. The following is a rough cut of our (mostly Dan's) thoughts on this. If this will work for the LWG we can refine and provide it in advance (late Wednesday or Thursday ?) to Hillary.

thanks
Chip

RI/FS:

-- Schedule status -- to include some summary of the push and pull of how we've gotten to an extension, with some time for LWG to say why they need the time and some time for EPA to describe how we arrived at tough decisions on this. I think the important joint message is that we are all after a quality product in as timely a fashion as possible. None of us has an interest in this process taking any more time or costing more money than is necessary, and we're all aware these meters are running. At the same time, if there are real issues, we need to address them or face the prospect of costly "surprises" later.

-- Summary of key steps of work to be completed, both RI and FS

-- Discussion of any especially key issues or milestones that we expect to have to work through.

-- Expectations in terms of a proposed plan/ROD schedule.

Source Control:

-- Status in terms of overall progress
-- Key issues being encountered
-- Look ahead to how well source control will dovetail with the RI/FS

